

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ROXUL USA, INC.,

Plaintiff,

C.A. No. 17-CV-01258-MAK

V.

ARMSTRONG WORLD  
INDUSTRIES, INC.,

Defendant.

**PLAINTIFF ROXUL USA, INC.'S PROPOSED JURY VERDICT SHEET**

Pursuant to the Court’s March 4, 2019 Scheduling Order (D.I. 271) and the Court’s Policies & Procedures (Jan. 2019), Plaintiff Roxul USA, Inc. d/b/a Rockfon (“Rockfon” or “Plaintiff”), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby submits the following proposed jury verdict sheet. Plaintiff notes that the proposed verdict sheet submitted herein is identical in form and substance to the verdict sheet used by Chief Judge Leonard Stark in *GN Netcom, Inc. v. Plantronics, Inc.*, 278 F. Supp. 3d 824 (D. Del. 2017). As the Court acknowledged in its March 8, 2019 Memorandum (D.I. 275), the claims at issue in the *GN Netcom* case are identical to those presented by Rockfon. Rockfon reserves the right to supplement or amend this proposed verdict sheet as necessary.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ROXUL USA, INC.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	C.A. No. 17-CV-01258-MAK
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
ARMSTRONG WORLD	)	
INDUSTRIES, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

**PLAINTIFF ROXUL USA, INC.’S PROPOSED JURY VERDICT SHEET**

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

1. Has Roxul proven that the relevant market is the sale of suspended acoustical ceiling tiles (“SACTs”) in the United States?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

*If you answer this question “Yes,” please complete 2-5 below. If you answer this question “No,” please skip to the end.*

2. Has Roxul proven all of the elements of its Sherman Act Section 1 Unreasonable Restraint of Trade claim?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

3. Has Roxul proven all of the elements of its Sherman Act Section 2 Monopolization claim?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

4. Has Roxul proven all of the elements of its Sherman Act Section 2 Attempt to Monopolize claim?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

5. Has Roxul proven all of the elements of its Clayton Act Section 3 claim?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

*If you answered "Yes" to any of Questions 2 - 5, please complete Question 6. If you answer "No" to all of Questions 2 - 5, please skip to the end*

6. Has Roxul proven that Armstrong's acts caused Roxul to suffer antitrust injury and damages?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

7. What is the total extent of damages Roxul is entitled to recover?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

*Please sign this verdict sheet and inform the court security officer that you have reached a verdict.*

**We, the jurors, by signing below, indicate our unanimous verdict.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jury Foreperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Juror

\_\_\_\_\_  
Juror

\_\_\_\_\_  
Juror

\_\_\_\_\_  
Juror

\_\_\_\_\_  
Juror

\_\_\_\_\_  
Juror

\_\_\_\_\_  
Juror

Dated: April \_\_, 2019

Dated: March 11, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

FARNAN LLP

/s/ Michael J. Farnan

Joseph J. Farnan, Jr. (Bar No. 100245)

Brian E. Farnan (Bar No. 4089)

Michael J. Farnan (Bar No. 5165)

919 North Market Street, 12th Floor

Wilmington, DE 19801

Tel: (302) 777-0300

Fax: (302) 777-0301

farnan@farnanlaw.com

bfarnan@farnanlaw.com

mfarnan@farnanlaw.com

Christopher S. Finnerty (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Jeffrey S. Patterson (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Michael R. Murphy (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Morgan T. Nickerson (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Emily E. Gianetta (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Jack S. Brodsky (admitted *pro hac vice*)

K&L GATES LLP

State Street Financial Center

One Lincoln Street

Boston, MA 02111-2950

Tel: (617) 261-3100

Fax: (617) 261-3175

chris.finnerty@klgates.com

jeffrey.patterson@klgates.com

michael.r.murphy@klgates.com

morgan.nickerson@klgates.com

emily.gianetta@klgates.com

jack.brodsky@klgates.com

*Counsel for Plaintiff Roxul USA, Inc.*